

Applicants: EDLIS, Ofir et al.  
Serial No.: 09/778,818  
Filed: February 8, 2001  
Page 6

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**NOV 30 2006**

### REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks.

### STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-8 and 10-19 are pending in this application. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

### EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS AMENDMENT

With respect to numbered paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, Applicants acknowledge the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10-19 of the previous Office Action.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS

#### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In numbered paragraphs 3 and 4 on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-11, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gollnick et al. (US Patent No. 5,940,771). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of the remarks that follow.

Claims 1, 10, and 15 include a radio frequency module that receives through an antenna incoming wireless communication signals and performs background processing of at least a portion of said received signals at a second, faster clock rate. It is respectfully submitted that Gollnick does not teach this feature.

In contrast, in col. 5, lines 56-63, Gollnick teaches "The terminal is operated normally at a slow system clock rate, of the order of 2400 baud, to minimize the generation of digital noise, and is switched to a fast clock rate such as 9600 baud during barcode scanning to allow the data obtained from the barcode scan to be processed at a higher rate." Thus, Gollnick teaches the processing of barcode scan data and not the claimed processing of received wireless communication signals. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 10, and 15 and the claims dependent therefrom are

Applicants: EDLIS, Ofir et al.  
Serial No.: 09/778,818  
Filed: February 8, 2001  
Page 7

not anticipated by Gollnick. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is therefore requested to be withdrawn.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In numbered paragraph 5 and 6 on pages 4-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of Challa et al. (US Patent No. 6,453,181). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 4 and 5 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the addition of the teachings of Challa does not cure the deficiencies of Gollnick which have been expressed above regarding Claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that Claims 4-5 are patentable.

In numbered paragraph 7 on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of Sih et al. (US Patent No. 6,608,858). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 12 and 17 depend from Claim 10 and Claim 15 respectively. The addition of the teachings of Sih does not cure the deficiencies of Gollnick which have been expressed above regarding Claims 10 and 15. Therefore, it is submitted that Claims 12 and 17 are patentable.

In numbered paragraph 8 on pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 13, 14, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of Watts, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 6,173,409). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 10 and Claims 18 and 19 depend from Claim 15. The addition of the teachings of Watts, Jr. does not cure the deficiencies of Gollnick which have been expressed above regarding Claims 10 and 15. Therefore, it is submitted that Claims 13, 14, 18 and 19 are patentable.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of

Applicants: EDLIS, Ofir et al.  
Serial No.: 09/778,818  
Filed: February 8, 2001  
Page 8

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 30 2006

Challa, the rejection of Claims 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of Sih and the rejection of Claims 13, 14, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of Watts, Jr.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's citation of non-applied references. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are patentable over this art.

### CONCLUSION

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss any still outstanding matters with respect to the present application.

Please credit or debit Deposit Account No. 50-3355 if any fees are due.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert D. Schaffer  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 33,775

Dated: November 30, 2006

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP.  
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor  
New York, NY 10036  
Phone: (646) 878-0800  
Fax: (646) 878-0801